

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

**REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for her generous assistance during a telephone interview on July 25, 2007. During said interview, the Examiner expressed her agreement that the present amendment avoids the combination of Schutt and Kraft.

2. **35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2003/0217034 ("Schutt") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,633,867 ("Kraft"). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 describes a matter-centric document management system (DMS) that includes:

means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type; and

an attribute assignment component to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type; and

a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file.

While Schutt does describe a search function, there is no teaching in Schutt that user formulated queries can be saved to a matter file. Kraft describes a session query that is saved to a session query/results repository on a client for the duration of the session. There is no teaching in Kraft of a matter file or of saving user-formulated queries to a matter file. In fact, the query terminates as soon as the session terminates. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of Schutt and Kraft of a matter centric document system that includes each and every element described in claim 1, including a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file. Accordingly, the present rejection is deemed improper. The foregoing remarks apply equally to claim 16.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the application, Applicant amends the independent claims to describe:

"means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

corresponding to a document type;

an attribute assignment component to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type; and

a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders.

Support for the above amendment is found at ¶¶ 0048-0049 of U.S. publication no. 2005/0108293.

There is no indication in the combination of Schutt and Kraft that the user has any control of the query or any access to it after it has been launched. Schutt is completely silent regarding queries. Kraft describes a session query that is saved to a session query repository (col. 6, line 42) and periodically updated for the duration of the session (col. 6, lines 47-50). The process of monitoring open sessions and updating queries is carried out by the session manager and the dynamic query matcher (col. 6, lines 44-51). There is no teaching or suggestion in Kraft that the user can examine session queries or select them, or that the user has any access either to the session manager or the dynamic query matcher. Nor is there any teaching that the query can be re-run at a later time at the user's option. In fact, Kraft is completely silent as to what becomes of the query after the session terminates. There is additionally no teaching or suggestion that a saved query can be associated with documents and folders within the system. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, describes subject matter that is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Schutt and Kraft, and is therefore allowable over the combination.

Claim 16 has been similarly amended and is therefore allowable on the same basis as claim 1. In view of their dependence from allowable parents, the dependents are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claims 1-2 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 20030163490 ("Kitamura"). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner acknowledges that there is no teaching or

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

suggestion in Kitamura of a matter-centric document system that includes the elements:

means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type;

an attribute assignment component to automatically create metadata data fields for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type; and

a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file.

As applicant has previously demonstrated, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed subject matter in Kraft, either. Accordingly, because the combination fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claimed invention, the present rejection is deemed to be improper. Even if the present rejection were not improper, the above amendment to the independent claims would overcome the present rejection. Because the combination of Kitamura and Kraft contains no teaching or suggestion of the independent claims as amended, the present rejection is deemed improper/overcome. The above remarks apply equally to claim 16. In view of their dependence from allowable parent claims, the dependent claims are deemed allowable without any separate consideration of their merits.

Claim 4 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,127,676 ("Linsey"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 6-7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,269,369 ("Robertson"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,369,840 ("Barnett"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of Barnett and further in view of Robertson. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

further in view of U.S. publication no. 2003/0115270 ("Funk"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0049727 ("Rothkop"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,401,097 ("McCotter"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. patent no. 5,864,865 ("Lakis"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 3 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Schutt. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 4 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Linsey. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 5 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,245 ("Huang"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 8 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Barnett. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 9 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Barnett and further in view of Robertson. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Funk. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 12 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Rothkop. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

rejection is deemed overcome.

Claim 13 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of McCotter. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Lakis. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Kraft and further in view of Robertson. In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 1, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

Claims 16-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Schutt in view of Kraft and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0169650 ("Dougherty"). In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 16, the present rejection is deemed overcome.

4. No new matter is added by way of the foregoing amendments.

5. The above amendments are made in the interest of advancing prosecution of the Application and do not signify agreement with the Examiner's position. Nor do they indicate an intention to sacrifice claim scope. Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue patent protection of a scope it reasonably believes it is entitled to in one or more future submissions.


6. For the record, Applicant respectfully traverses any and all factual assertions in the file that are not supported by documentary evidence. Such include assertions based on findings of inherency, assertions based on official notice, and any other assertions of what is well known or commonly known in the prior art.

Application ser. no. 10/716,944

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. As such, Applicant earnestly requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims. Should the Examiner deem it helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862